

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed * has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejection(s) Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 11 – 15 and 17 – 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Chavez et al. (U.S. pat. no. 6,549,772).

Claims 11, 28 and 29 have been amended to emphasize that the enhancer is an add-on component which is coupled to a receiver through an antenna port designed for connection to an antenna which receives RF signals. This underscores the distinction between the claimed invention and the applied art. In the claimed invention, a conventional stand-alone receiver designed to receive an input signal containing a carrier frequency component can be coupled to an enhancer which operates to increase its dynamic range by pushing through to the receiver a signal at the intermediate frequency of the receiver, bypassing the carrier frequency downconversion process of the receiver, with its inherent limitations when a high energy signal is encountered. The mechanism relied upon for pushing the downconverted signal from the enhancer to the receiver is IF blowthrough, described in the specification at the top of page 7.

By contrast, Chavez et al. discloses a system in which a plurality of remote transceivers (112a) communicate with a local transceiver (130a) via a data link (120a) in order to provide area coverage in the presence of obstacles such as walls, ceilings and floors. There is no discussion of

pushing downconverted signals at the local transceiver intermediate frequency from the remote transceivers to the local transceiver, using IF blowthrough, and no indication that the local transceiver is a self-contained component having an antenna port to which the remote transceivers are coupled for signal transfer.

It will be appreciated that, according to the M.P.E.P., a claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) only if each and every claim element is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.¹ The aforementioned reasons clearly indicate the contrary, and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection based on Chavez et al. is respectfully urged. In particular, Claim 11 has been amended to specifically recite “an attachable coupling line for sending signals from the downconverter to the receiver *by way of the antenna port*” (emphasis added), with the antenna port of the receiver being “for coupling to an antenna through which an RF signal including a carrier frequency is received.” No such antenna port is disclosed in Chavez et al. because the local transceiver 130 of Chavez et al. is not designed as a stand-alone device intended to receive RF signals including a carrier frequency, but is rather designed *a priori* to operate in conjunction with the remote transceivers 112 and to receive signals that are instead preprocessed by the transceivers 112. For this reason, Chavez et al. fails to anticipate Claim 11 and Claims 21, 28 and 29 which recite similar features. In addition, in these claims recite “an attachable coupling line” (Claim 11), “attachably coupling the downconverted signal” (Claim 21), “coupling means for attachably coupling” (Claim 28), and “an attachable coupler” (Claim 29), features which are directed to the attachable, add-on nature of the enhancer, as distinguished from the remote transceivers 112 of Chavez et al., which are

¹ Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) § 2131. See also *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

integrated in the design of the system as whole. For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that an anticipation rejection of Claims 11 – 15 and 17 – 31 based on Chavez et al. is improper and should be withdrawn.

Rejection(s) Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1 -- 7, 9 – 10, 16 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Chavez et al. in view of Peterzell (U.S. 2002/0123319).

Claim 1 has also been amended to specifically recite “a coupler attachable to the antenna port for sending the downconverted signal to the receiver by way of the antenna port,” with the antenna port of the receiver being “for coupling to an antenna through which an RF signal including a carrier frequency is received.” As discussed above, no such antenna port is disclosed in Chavez et al. because the local transceiver 130 of Chavez et al. is not designed as a stand-alone device intended to receive RF signals including a carrier frequency, but is rather designed *a priori* to operate in conjunction with the remote transceivers 112 and to receive signals that are instead preprocessed by the transceivers 112. Peterzell does not mitigate this shortcoming. Accordingly, the combination of Chavez et al. and Peterzell, even if properly motivated, would not achieve or render obvious the presently claimed invention, and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection based on same is therefore respectfully urged.

Newly-Added Claims

Claims 33 – 37 have been added to further particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 33 – 37 are directed to the IF blowthrough nature of the transmission from the add-on enhancer to the receiver, as discussed in the specification in the beginning of page 7.

Conclusion

In view of the preceding discussion, Applicants respectfully urge that the claims of the present application define patentable subject matter and should be passed to allowance. Such allowance is respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone call would help advance prosecution of the present invention, the Examiner is kindly invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number below.

Please charge any additional required fee, including those necessary to obtain extensions of time to render timely the filing of the instant Reply, or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited, to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,
THELEN REID & PRIEST, L.L.P.

Dated: 1/20/05



Khaled Shami
Reg. No. 38,745

Thelen Reid & Priest LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 282-1855
Fax. (408) 287-8040